UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/895,948	06/29/2001	Shervin Erfani	3-26-22	8097

30541 7590 11/03/2006

LAW OFFICE OF JOHN LIGON
213 E. HIGHLAND AVENUE
P.O. BOX 281
ATLANTIC HIGHLANDS, NJ 07716

EXAMINER	
CURS, NATHAN M	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2613	

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

st

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 09/895,948
Filing Date: June 29, 2001
Appellant(s): ERFANI ET AL.

John A. Ligon
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

MAILED
NOV 03 2006
GROUP 2600

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 16 October 2006 appealing from the Office action mailed 29 December 2005.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

No evidence is relied upon by the examiner in the rejection of the claims under appeal.

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 8-10 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Moy et al. (US Published Patent Application No. 2003/0035411A1).

Regarding claim 1, Moy et al. disclose an apparatus for providing direct signaling for switching and control of transmissions in an integrated optical network, said apparatus comprising: a plurality of electrical signaling interfaces (fig. 1, elements TND and paragraph 0048) for receiving requests from external signaling networks (fig. 1, elements UD and IUD and paragraphs 0038 to 0040); a processing module for processing said requests from said external signaling networks (fig. 1, element TND and paragraph 0065); and at least one optical signaling interface for coupling to optical components in said integrated optical network (fig. 1, elements

IUD and TND and paragraphs 0039, 0040 and 0047), said optical signaling interface being operable to transmit processed requests from said processing module for assignment of optical channels for said optical components (paragraphs 0059 and 0060), wherein signaling processed by said processing module from said external signaling networks is provided directly to the optical network components via said optical signaling interface and is independent of legacy signaling methodologies employed by ones of said external signaling networks (fig. 1, elements TND and paragraphs 0039, 0040 and 0047, where the external signaling is provided directly to the OTN via the TND which includes the optical signaling interface; paragraphs 0041 and 0042, which describe a variety of different possible legacy protocols of the UD/IUD external signals; and paragraphs 0099-0102, which describe the signaling across the OTN as independent of the protocols of the external signals, i.e. as based on, for example, MPLS or RSVP).

Regarding claim 8, Moy et al. disclose the apparatus of claim 1, wherein said optical signaling interface couples to said optical components through an optical user network interface (paragraphs 0033, 0036, 0039, 0040 and 0047).

Regarding claim 9, Moy et al. disclose the apparatus of claim 8, wherein said apparatus is further operable to control signaling (fig. 1, element TND and paragraph 0065) of electrical switching devices (paragraph 0041), where the User Devices can be electrical switching devices as disclose by Moy et al., and that couple to said apparatus through an optical service node (fig. 1, element TND and paragraphs 0047 and 0048).

Regarding claim 10, Moy et al. disclose the apparatus of claim 1, wherein said apparatus is operable to assign individual wavelengths in said optical components in accordance with requests from said external signaling networks and allocate calls to existing wavelengths (paragraphs 0059 and 0060).

Regarding claim 16, Moy et al. disclose a method for providing direct signaling for switching and control of transmissions in an integrated optical network, said method comprising: receiving requests from external signaling networks at an electrical signaling interface (fig. 1, elements TND and paragraph 0048 and elements UD and IUD and paragraphs 0038 to 0040); processing said requests from said external signaling networks (fig. 1, element TND and paragraph 0065); and transmitting processed requests from said processing module via an optical signaling interface that couples to optical components in said integrated optical network (fig. 1, elements IUD and TND and paragraphs 0039, 0040 and 0047) for assignment of optical channels for said optical components (paragraphs 0059 and 0060), wherein said processing step operates to process signaling requests from the external signaling networks for provision directly to the optical network components via said optical signaling network interface, the processed signaling being independent of legacy signaling methodologies employed by ones of said external signaling networks (fig. 1, elements TND and paragraphs 0039, 0040 and 0047, where the external signaling is provided directly to the OTN via the TND which includes the optical signaling interface; paragraphs 0041 and 0042, which describe a variety of different possible legacy protocols of the UD/IUD external signals, and paragraphs 0099-0102, which describe the signaling across the OTN as independent of the protocols of the external signals, i.e. as based on, for example, MPLS or RSVP).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moy et al. (US Published Patent Application No. 2003/0035411A1) in view of Wei et al. ("Network control and management of a reconfigurable WDM network"; Wei et al.; Military Communications Conference, 1996, IEEE Conference Proceedings, Vol. 2, Oct. 1996, Pages 581-586).

Regarding claim 3, Moy et al. disclose the apparatus of claim 1, wherein said optical components are selected from the group consisting of optical cross connects, add/drop multiplexers and optical service nodes (paragraphs 0042 and 0048). Moy et al. do not disclose at least one optical cross connect and optical add/drop multiplexer. Wei et al. disclose an optical network where an optical cross connect can serve as an optical add/drop multiplexer when interfaced with external elements (fig. 1 and page 581, col. 2, 1st paragraph of heading 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the optical cross connect of Wei et al. for the optical cross connects of Moy et al., in order to provide the advantage of using an optical cross connect that can also functional as an optical add/drop multiplexer by interfacing the optical cross connect with external elements, such that separate OXC and optical ADM equipment are not required.

Regarding claim 18, Moy et al. disclose the method of claim 16, wherein said optical components are selected from the group consisting of optical cross connects, add/drop multiplexers and optical service nodes (paragraphs 0042 and 0048). Moy et al. do not disclose at least one optical cross connect and optical add/drop multiplexer. Wei et al. disclose an optical network where an optical cross connect can serve as an optical add/drop multiplexer when interfaced with external elements (fig. 1 and page 581, col. 2, 1st paragraph of heading 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the optical cross connect of Wei et al. for the optical cross connects of Moy et al., in order to

provide the advantage of using an optical cross connect that can also functional as an optical add/drop multiplexer by interfacing the optical cross connect with external elements, such that separate OXC and optical ADM equipment are not required.

Claims 2, 4-7, 11-14, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moy et al. (US Published Patent Application No. 2003/0035411A1) in view of Berg et al. (US Patent No. 6680952).

Regarding claim 2, Moy et al. disclose the apparatus of claim 1, wherein said external signaling networks are selected from the group consisting of circuit switched signaling networks and packet switched signaling networks (paragraph 0042), but do not disclose that the group also includes SS7, H323, SIP and other enhanced signaling system (ESS) apparatus. However, Moy et al. do disclose that the external signaling networks can be any of a variety of apparatus for transmitting and receiving signals with various electrical or optical transmitting or receiving, and multiplexing, switching, routing, etc. (paragraph 0041). Berg et al. disclose an external network gateway apparatus that handles signaling traffic from a variety of sources (col. 4, lines 30-44), where these sources include SS7, H323, SIP and other enhanced signaling systems (col. 6, lines 23-35), and where the external network gateway interfaces to a core network via electrical or optical interfaces (col. 7, line 65 to col. 8, line 13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the gateway of Berg et al. as one or more of the User Devices of the signaling network of Moy et al. to provide the advantage of interfacing voice, voice over IP, and other signaling services directly with the dynamically provisionable OTN network of Moy et al. to create optical trails through the OTN of dynamic bandwidth corresponding to these additional services.

Regarding claim 4, Moy et al. disclose the apparatus of claim 1, wherein said processing module is a signaling processor (fig. 1, element TND and paragraph 0065), and that the external signaling networks can be any of a variety of apparatus for transmitting and receiving signals with various electrical or optical transmitting or receiving, and multiplexing, switching, routing, etc. (paragraph 0041), but do not disclose that said processing module is a call control processor. Berg et al. disclose an external network gateway apparatus that handles signaling traffic from a variety of sources (col. 4, lines 30-44), where these sources include SS7, H323, SIP and other enhanced signaling systems (col. 6, lines 23-35), and where the external network gateway interfaces to a core network via electrical or optical interfaces (col. 7, line 65 to col. 8, line 13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the gateway of Berg et al. as one or more of the User Devices of the signaling network of Moy et al. to provide the advantage of interfacing voice, voice over IP, and other signaling services directly with the dynamically provisionable OTN network of Moy et al. to create optical trails through the OTN of dynamic bandwidth corresponding to these additional services. Further, the processor of Moy et al. providing signaling processing for creating optical trails through the OTN of dynamic bandwidth corresponding to these additional call related services would inherently make the signaling processor of Moy et al. a call control processor.

Regarding claim 5, Moy et al. in view of Berg et al. disclose the apparatus of claim 4, further including a signaling and endpoint applications module coupled to said processor module for providing electronic and optical routing decisions (Moy et al.: paragraph 0065), where the firmware or software corresponding to the routing functions of the processor are the signaling and endpoint applications module.

Regarding claim 6, Moy et al. disclose the apparatus of claim 5, further including a network management and provisioning module for providing network management interaction

for reporting of alarms and receiving commands for provisioning and reconfiguration of said apparatus (Moy et al.: paragraphs 0083 and 0084), where it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that the information about TNDs, ports and channels of TNDs, UDs, ports and channels of UDs, etc. of the network management module of Moy et al. would include alarm reporting information, as alarm reporting as part of network management of signaling services is well known in the art.

Regarding claim 7, Moy et al. disclose the apparatus of claim 6, and disclose a network management control system, or system administration module, for dynamic bandwidth provision on OTNs, providing an operator interface for administration and maintenance of said system (paragraphs 0005 to 0007).

Regarding claim 11, Moy et al. disclose an apparatus for providing switching fabric independent allocation of transport resources in an integrated optical network, said apparatus comprising: a plurality of electrical signaling interfaces (fig. 1, elements TND and paragraph 0048) for receiving requests from external signaling networks (fig. 1, elements UD and IUD and paragraphs 0038 to 0040); a signaling module for processing said requests from said external signaling networks (fig. 1, element TND and paragraph 0065); a signaling and endpoint applications module coupled to said signaling and call control module for providing electronic and optical routing decisions (Moy et al.: paragraph 0065), where the firmware or software corresponding to the routing functions of the processor are the signaling and endpoint applications module; a network management and provisioning module for providing network management interaction for reporting of alarms and receiving commands for provisioning and reconfiguration of said apparatus (paragraphs 0083 and 0084), where it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that the information about TNDs, ports and channels of TNDs, UDs, ports and channels of UDs, etc. of the network

management module of Moy et al. would include alarm reporting information, as alarm reporting as part of network management of signaling services is well known in the art.; and at least one optical signaling network interface for coupling to optical components in said integrated optical network (fig. 1, elements IUD and TND and paragraphs 0039, 0040 and 0047), said optical signaling interface being operable to transmit processed requests from said signaling module for assignment of optical channels for said optical components (paragraphs 0059 and 0060), wherein signaling processed by said signaling and call control module from the external signaling networks is provided directly to the optical network components via said optical signaling network interface and is independent of legacy signaling methodologies employed by ones of said external signaling networks (fig. 1, elements TND and paragraphs 0039, 0040 and 0047, where the external signaling is provided directly to the OTN via the TND which includes the optical signaling interface; paragraphs 0041 and 0042, which describe a variety of different possible legacy protocols of the UD/IUD external signals; and paragraphs 0099-0102, which describe the signaling across the OTN as independent of the protocols of the external signals, i.e. as based on, for example, MPLS or RSVP). Moy et al. disclose that the external signaling networks can be any of a variety of apparatus for transmitting and receiving signals with various electrical or optical transmitting or receiving, and multiplexing, switching, routing, etc. (paragraph 0041), but do not disclose that the signaling module is also a call control module. Berg et al. disclose an external network gateway apparatus that handles signaling traffic from a variety of sources (col. 4, lines 30-44), where these sources include SS7, H323, SIP and other enhanced signaling systems (col. 6, lines 23-35) for call signals, and where the external network gateway interfaces to a core network via electrical or optical interfaces (col. 7, line 65 to col. 8, line 13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the gateway of Berg et al. as one or more of the User Devices of the signaling network of

Moy et al. to provide the advantage of interfacing voice, voice over IP, and other signaling services directly with the dynamically provisionable OTN network of Moy et al. to create optical trails through the OTN of dynamic bandwidth corresponding to these additional services. Further, the processor of Moy et al. providing signaling processing for creating optical trails through the OTN of dynamic bandwidth corresponding to these additional call related services would inherently make the signaling processor of Moy et al. a call control processor.

Regarding claim 12, Moy et al. in view of Berg et al. disclose the apparatus of claim 11, wherein said apparatus is further operable to control signaling (Moy et al.: fig. 1, element TND and paragraph 0065) of electrical switching devices (Moy et al.: paragraph 0041), where the User Devices can be electrical switching devices as disclose by Moy et al., and that couple to said apparatus through an optical service node (Moy et al.: fig. 1, element TND and paragraphs 0047 and 0048).

Regarding claim 13, Moy et al. in view of Berg et al. disclose the apparatus of claim 11, wherein said apparatus is operable to assign individual wavelengths in said optical components in accordance with requests from said external signaling networks and allocate calls to existing wavelengths (Moy et al.: paragraphs 0059 and 0060).

Regarding claim 14, Moy et al. in view of Berg et al. disclose the apparatus of claim 11, wherein said external signaling networks are selected from the group consisting of circuit switched signaling networks, packet switched signaling networks (Moy et al.: paragraph 0042), and SS7, H323, SIP and other enhanced signaling system (ESS) apparatus (Berg et al.: col. 6, lines 23-35).

Regarding claim 17, Moy et al. disclose the method of claim 16, wherein said external signaling networks are selected from the group consisting of circuit switched signaling networks and packet switched signaling networks (paragraphs 0042), but do not disclose that the group

also includes SS7, H323, SIP and other enhanced signaling system (ESS) apparatus. However, Moy et al. do disclose that the external signaling networks can be any of a variety of apparatus for transmitting and receiving signals with various electrical or optical transmitting or receiving, and multiplexing, switching, routing, etc. (paragraph 0041). Berg et al. disclose an external network gateway apparatus that handles signaling traffic from a variety of sources (col. 4, lines 30-44), where these sources include SS7, H323, SIP and other enhanced signaling systems (col. 6, lines 23-35), and where the external network gateway interfaces to a core network via electrical or optical interfaces (col. 7, line 65 to col. 8, line 13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the gateway of Berg et al. as one or more of the User Devices of the signaling network of Moy et al. to provide the advantage of interfacing voice, voice over IP, and other signaling services directly with the dynamically provisionable OTN network of Moy et al. to create optical trails through the OTN of dynamic bandwidth corresponding to these additional services.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moy et al. (US Published Patent Application No. 2003/0035411A1) in view of Berg et al. (US Patent No. 6680952) as applied to claims 2, 4-7, 11-14, and 17 above, and further in view of Wei et al. ("Network control and management of a reconfigurable WDM network"; Wei et al.; Military Communications Conference, 1996, IEEE Conference Proceedings, Vol. 2, Oct. 1996, Pages 581-586).

Regarding claim 15, Moy et al. in view of Berg et al. disclose the apparatus of claim 11, wherein said optical components are selected from the group consisting of optical cross connects, add/drop multiplexers and optical service nodes (Moy et al.: paragraphs 0042 and 0048). Moy et al. in view of Berg et al. do not disclose at least one optical cross connect and

optical add/drop multiplexer. Wei et al. disclose an optical network where an optical cross connect can serve as an optical add/drop multiplexer when interfaced with external elements (fig. 1 and page 581, col. 2, 1st paragraph of heading 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the optical cross connect of Wei et al. for the optical cross connects of Moy et al. in view of Berg et al., in order to provide the advantage of using an optical cross connect that can also functional as an optical add/drop multiplexer by interfacing the optical cross connect with external elements, such that separate OXC and optical ADM equipment are not required.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moy et al. (US Published Patent Application No. 2003/0035411A1) in view of Milton et al. (US Patent No. 6084694).

Regarding claim 19, Moy et al. disclose a system for providing direct signaling for switching and control of transmissions in an integrated optical network, said system comprising: a signaling apparatus including, a plurality of electrical signaling interfaces (fig. 1, elements TND and paragraph 0048) for receiving requests from external signaling networks (fig. 1, elements UD and IUD and paragraphs 0038 to 0040); a processing module for processing said requests from said external signaling networks (fig. 1, element TND and paragraph 0065); and at least one optical signaling interface for coupling to optical components in said integrated optical network (fig. 1, elements IUD and TND and paragraphs 0039, 0040 and 0047), said optical signaling interface being operable to transmit processed requests from said processing module for assignment of optical channels for said optical components (paragraphs 0059 and 0060); and an optical service node including, at least one optical cross connect (OXC) (fig. 1, element TND and paragraph 0048); said OXC including at least one interface to an optical network or

other optical components (fig. 2, element TND, 50, 56 and 62 and paragraph 0051), said optical service node coupling to said signaling apparatus through said optical signaling interface wherein signaling processed by said processing module from the external signaling networks is provided directly to the optical network components via said optical signaling interface and is independent of legacy signaling methodologies employed by ones of said external signaling networks (fig. 1, elements TND and paragraphs 0039, 0040 and 0047, where the external signaling is provided directly to the OTN via the TND which includes the optical signaling interface; paragraphs 0041 and 0042, which describe a variety of different possible legacy protocols of the UD/IUD external signals; and paragraphs 0099-0102, which describe the signaling across the OTN as independent of the protocols of the external signals, i.e. as based on, for example, MPLS or RSVP; and paragraphs 0039, 0040 and 0047). Moy et al. do not disclose that the optical service node has at least one optical add/drop multiplexer (OADM) in addition to the OXC, the OADM including electrical interfaces to circuit switched and packet switched fabrics. Milton et al. disclose an optical add/drop multiplexer that uses WDM and is protocol and bit rate independent (col. 2, lines 11-29) with optical interfaces to the OTN side and electrical interfaces to the client side (col. 4, line 61 to col. 5, line 35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interface the OADM of Milton et al. with the optical TND apparatus of Moy et al. to provide the advantage of being able to add/drop the various signals from the Moy et al. network that are in a native electrical format external to the optical network, in addition to the disclosed optical cross connecting optical signals of the Moy et al. network at the optical TND apparatus.

(10) Response to Argument

Starting on page 7 of the appeal brief, under section "I. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Claim Rejections", the appellant argues that the cited art does not teach or suggest one or more distinguishing features of the claimed invention. However, the appellant's arguments are not persuasive. On page 7, lines 7-11, the appellant argues specifically that Moy does not provide a teaching that shows or suggests "a signaling system that operates to interface multiple legacy external signaling systems to an integrated optical network independently of the signaling techniques/protocols of those multiple external signaling systems". This argument does not exactly reflect the claim limitations of claims 1 or 16. Claims 1 and 16 recite that the claimed processing module does actually receive signaling (i.e. "requests") from the external signaling networks, and then the signaling, **once processed**, is independent of legacy signaling methodologies; but the claims do not recite that that the legacy systems are **interfaced** to an optical network independent of the legacy signaling methodologies, as stated by the appellant. In other words, the claims are **not** drawn to the legacy signaling methodologies being **ignored when interfaced** to an optical network; rather, the claims are drawn to the legacy methodologies being **no longer used past the interface** with the optical network, i.e. past the "processing module" which processes the received legacy requests. With respect to Moy reading on the corresponding claim limitations, Moy establishes that the systems external to the IUD devices of Moy are legacy systems since these external systems are based on legacy protocols such ATM or SONET (Moy: paragraphs 0042 and 0043). The IUD devices of Moy are the interface points between the external systems and the TNDs, the optical network devices (Moy: paragraphs 0040 and 0047). The signaling **methodology** used to establish an optical trail across the optical network is **different from**, i.e. independent of, the external signaling methodologies; Moy's "trail creation signal" (Moy: paragraphs 0099-0102), which can be based

on MPLS or RSVP (i.e. different from legacy ATM or SONET), is used to request a trail across the optical network. Paragraphs 0105-0118 further describe unique characteristics of Moy's "trail creation signal". Moy's optical trail request **methodology**, is independent from the external signaling **methodologies**.

The appellant next argues on appeal brief page 7, lines 11-14 that the citations from Moy used "in support of the Examiner's position... teach no more than that Moy operates to convert between electrical and optical signals at some interfaces"; the appellant does not refer to the specific citations. However, while Moy does in fact describe the act of converting between electrical and optical signals at some interfaces, this is one act among many acts performed at the Moy interfaces. As already described for the previous argument, Moy's signaling methodology for requesting a trail across the optical network is independent of legacy signaling methodologies. Moy discloses much more than just electrical to optical conversion at the interfaces; Moy's "trail creation signal" for example, requires establishing values for at least ten different "optical trail parameters" (Moy: paragraph 0108)

The appellant next argues on appeal brief page 7, lines 15-16 that "the thrust of Moy is directed to the transmissions of payload via Moy's network, rather than to signaling for such transmission". However, Moy's signaling method of requesting a trail across the optical network directly contradicts this argument. Moy uses non-payload, "signaling" signals for requesting an optical trail across the optical network, with actual payloads being transmitted across the optical network **after** the trail is established. In appeal brief page 7, lines 16-19, the appellant argues that "the only signaling addressed by Moy is that of signaling between an end user device and an input node to the optical network of Moy". This argument is also contradicted by Moy's method of requesting a trail across the optical network.

The appellant next argues on appeal brief page 8, lines 1-3 that "Nothing in the teaching of Moy can reasonably be construed to teach or suggest such a ubiquitous signaling mechanism that operates independently of the external signaling networks to which it is interfaced". Again, what is actually claimed in claims 1 and 16 is that the claimed processing module receives signaling (i.e. "requests") from the external signal networks and that this signaling, **once processed**, is independent of legacy signaling **methodologies**. The claims do not recite that that the claimed signaling mechanism operates independently of the external signaling **networks**. The appellant cannot effectively argue that the claimed signaling mechanism operates "independently of the external signaling networks" if the claimed signaling mechanism in fact processes requests received from the external signaling networks.

The appellant argues on page 8 of the appeal brief, under section "II. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Claim Rejections", against the § 103 claim rejections for the same reasoning provided in the appellant's arguments against the § 102 rejections. Since the appellant's arguments against the § 102 rejections are not persuasive as described above, the argument against the § 103 rejections is not persuasive.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Nathan Curs

JASON CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Conferees:

Jason Chan (SPE)
Kenneth Vanderpuye (SPE)

KENNETH VANDERPUYE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER